

“from” field of the electronic message. Status messages can also be sent to the scanner’s e-mail address.

The Examiner compares an e-mail server in Rublee with the management server recited in the claims. This comparison is improper because Rublee’s e-mail server differs from the recited management server in several respects. First, unlike the recited management server, Rublee’s e-mail server does not provide additional function information to an additional function list receiver or an image processing apparatus. Rather, Rublee’s e-mail server merely receives e-mail data from the scanner and forwards the e-mail data to intended recipients. Second, unlike the recited management server, Rublee’s e-mail server is not a target of transmitted authentication information. Rublee’s authentication information is received and processed entirely independent of the e-mail server. Because of these differences between Rublee’s e-server and the management server recited in the claims, Rublee fails to anticipate claims 1-10, 12-20, and 22-23. Accordingly, the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn.

The Examiner compares Rublee’s e-mail addresses with the claimed additional function. This comparison is improper because Rublee’s e-mail addresses are not executable functions. The Examiner cites paragraph [0037] of the specification, which states “[t]he additional function is not limited thereto as long as it is a process that handles image data and executable by a computer”. This paragraph does not support the Examiner’s position because e-mail addresses do not constitute processes for handling image data, and e-mail addresses are not executable by a computer. Because of these differences between Rublee’s e-mail addresses and the claimed “additional function”, Rublee fails to anticipate claims 1-10, 12-20, and 22-23. Accordingly, the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn.

The Examiner compares Rublee's list of e-mails with the claimed list of additional functions. This comparison is improper because, as discussed above, Rublee's e-mails are not executable functions. Because of these differences between Rublee's e-mails and the claimed list of additional functions, Rublee fails to anticipate claims 1-10, 12-20, and 22-23. Accordingly, the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn.

The Examiner compares Rublee's entry of a client matter number with the claimed additional function selector. This comparison is improper because entry of a matter number does not constitute selection of a function. Rather, Rublee's entry of a client matter merely triggers automatic selection of a set of e-mail addresses associated with the client matter number. As discussed above, Rublee's e-mail addresses are not executable functions. Because of these differences between Rublee's entry of a client matter number and the claimed additional function selector, Rublee fails to anticipate claims 1-10. Accordingly, the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn.

Claims 11 and 21 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rublee in view of White, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0120009. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 11 and 21 depend, at least indirectly, from claims 1 and 14. As noted above, Rublee fails to teach or suggest the features of the independent claims. White fails to overcome Rublee's deficiencies. Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is

determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event that the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 325772033400.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 325772033400.

Dated: July 1, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By B. Westover
Benjamin P. Westover
Registration No.: 56,612
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 400
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7325